REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF R08-001, P08-002; Log No. 08-14-001 Highway 67 Self Storage April 2, 2009

			Does the proposed project conform to the linance findings?	
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT ☑	
Discussion:				
of the Multiple S	Species Conser	vation Progran	vements are located within the boundaries m. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat findings is not required.	
II. MSCP/BMO - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?				
	YES N	10 N	OT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT	
Discussion:				
within the bound conforms with the	daries of the Mo he Multiple Spe	ultiple Species cies Conserva	vements related to the proposed project are Conservation Program. The project ation Program and the Biological Mitigation gs dated December 9, 2008.	
III. GROUNDW the San Diego (he project comply with the requirements of ce?	
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT ⊠	
Discussion:				

Discussion:

The project will obtain its water supply from the Lakeside Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Sections 86.604(a) and (b)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Sections 86.604(c) and (d)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The <u>Steep Slope</u> section (Section 86.604(e))?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Section 86.604(f)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Section 86.604(g)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT

Discussion:

Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

Even though wetlands and/or wetland buffer areas have been identified on the project, the project has been found to be consistent with Article IV of the Resource Protection Ordinance, due to the following reasons: a) the project will not place any non-permitted uses within wetlands; b) the project will not allow grading, filling, construction, or placement of structures within identified wetlands; and c) the project will not allow any non-permitted uses within wetland buffer areas. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(a) and (b) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located near any floodway/floodplain fringe area as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance, nor is it located near any watercourse which is plotted on any official County floodway/floodplain map.

Steep Slopes:

Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be place in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are steep slopes on the property however, an open space easement is proposed over the entire steep slope lands. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(e) of the RPO.

Sensitive Habitats:

Staff has determined that although the site supports sensitive biological habitat, implementation of the mitigation measures described in a Biological Resources report prepared by Robin Church and dated November 15, 2008 will ensure that project impacts will not result in substantial adverse effects, or have a cumulatively considerable impact to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Section 86.604(f) of the RPO.

Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

The property has been surveyed by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Diane Shalom, on February 13, 2008 and it has been determined that the property contains several structures or remnants of structures dating from 1941-1946. These structures do not retain their original integrity since they have undergone many renovations and additions throughout the years. The standing structures are in very poor condition. Therefore, they are not considered significant resources. No archaeological resources were located on the property. Grading monitoring, consisting of a County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer will be a required condition of project approval because of the proximity of known archaeological sites in the area and the presence of historic structures on the property.

<u>V. STORMWATER ORDINANCE (WPO)</u> - Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
\boxtimes		

Discussion:

The Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) and Department of Public Works (DPW) staff reviewed the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) For Priority Projects prepared by Robert L. Bruckart, dated October 22, 2008 that was submitted to the County of San Diego on October 22, 2008. This document demonstrates that the project complies with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO, Section 67.817).

<u>VI. NOISE ORDINANCE</u> – Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan and the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance?

YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
\boxtimes		

Discussion:

The project would not expose people to nor generate potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

The project consists of a rezone and major use permit application for a three story mini storage building and a rezone from an A70 to RR1. An onsite, a two bedroom managers unit is planned for the 2nd floor, above the office. The project is subject to the most restrictive property line noise level limits that is a one-hour average 45 dBA Leq. Associated mechanical units will be located on the roof top, enclosed by a parapet wall on three sides. Noise levels generated by these proposed roof top mechanical units will comply with County property line noise standards due to attenuation by distance and the project design of the three sided roof top parapet wall. Additionally, the project includes a residential/live in type of unit that is subject to the interior noise requirements pursuant to the County Noise Element, Policy 4b. Staff will condition the project such that a noise study be conducted at the time proposed residential uses may exceed the interior noise requirement of 45 dBA. Therefore, project design considerations including the three sided roof top parapet wall enclosing the mechanical units and noise conditioning will ensure the project will comply with County noise standards.